

Remarks

Summary

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-67 were pending and were rejected. In the present response, editorial amendments were made to the claims. Claims 68-75 are new. No claims are cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-75 are presently pending and are under consideration.

Examiner Interview

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative Steven J. Prewitt during an October 21, 2010, telephonic interview during which the outstanding rejections were discussed. No specific agreement was reached. As further argued below, discussions focused on the fact that Danneels teaches a URL mapping system that uses "environmental" or state conditions to determine how to map the input URL. However, Danneels does not teach or suggest "analyzing a pattern of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern, wherein each pre-specified locator pattern does not comprise a locator of the first information page and identifies a plurality of additional valid locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page, the analyzing including comparing the locator pattern against a plurality of pre-specified locator patterns," as recited in claim 1.

Claim Objection

Claim 2 was objected to because of certain alleged informalities. Claim 2 has been amended herein thus obviating the objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10-13, 16-20, 22, 25-28, 31-39, 42-45, 48-53, 56-59, and 62-67 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) over US Patent No. 6,038,598 to Danneels. The rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the remarks below.

Danneels provides a system for mapping a requested URL to one or more sets of web pages based on an analysis of certain conditions or the state of the computing device. For example, if the web server is processing a heavy load, the URL may be directed to the web page set that has comparatively less video/graphics than another of the web page sets to reduce the server processing requirement. In Danneels, a request for a URL returns an individual URL, but the particular URL that is returned is dependent on conditions separate from the URL itself.

Claim 1 is, however, directed to “analyzing a pattern of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern, wherein each pre-specified locator pattern does not comprise a locator of the first information page and identifies a plurality of additional valid locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page, the analyzing including comparing the locator pattern against a plurality of pre-specified locator patterns....”

Danneels does not analyze “a pattern of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern” This recitation of claim 1 indicates that there is a “pre-specified locator pattern” and there is an analysis as to whether “the locator satisfies” the “pre-specified locator pattern.” Danneels does not identify “pre-specified locator pattern.” Claim 1, as amended, clarifies that “each pre-specified locator pattern does not comprise a locator of the first information page and identifies a plurality of additional valid locators” Danneels simply describes a URL that is mapped to alternative sets of pages. As such, there are no “pre-specified URL patterns” in Danneels as defined in claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Danneels fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 and that claim 1 is therefore patentable over Danneels.

Independent claims 19, 35, 50, and 64-67 recite similar elements to those of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 19, 35, 50, and 64-67 are patentable over Danneels.

Claims 2, 4, 10-13, 16-18, 20, 22, 25-28, 31-34, 36-39, 42-45, 48, 49, 51-53, 56-59, 62, and 63 depend from claims 1, 19, 35, and 50 incorporating their elements, respectively.

Thus, for at least the same reasons above, it is submitted that claims 2, 4, 10-13, 16-18, 20, 22, 25-28, 31-34, 36-39, 42-45, 48, 49, 51-53, 56-59, 62, and 63 are patentable over Danneels.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 5, 6, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, and 55

Claims 5, 6, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, and 55 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Danneels in view of US Patent No. 6,654,741 to Cohen. Claims 5, 6, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, and 55 are dependent on claims 1, 19, 35, and 50 and thus are patentable over Danneels for at least the same reasons discussed above. Cohen fails to overcome the deficiencies of Danneels. Thus, claims 5, 6, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, and 55 are patentable over Danneels in view of Cohen for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 7 and 8

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Danneels in view of Cohen and further in view of US Patent No. 6,094,665 to Lyons. Claims 7 and 8 are dependent on claims 6 and 5, respectively, and thus are patentable over Danneels and Cohen for at least the same reasons discussed above. Lyons fails to overcome the deficiencies of Danneels and Cohen. Thus, claims 7 and 8 are patentable over Danneels in view of Cohen and further in view of Lyons for at least the same reasons discussed above.

New Claims

Claims 68-75 are newly added herein. Each of claims 68-75 depends indirectly from claims 1, 19, 35, and 50 incorporating their elements, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons above, it is submitted that claims 68-75 are patentable over Danneels and Cohen.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2446. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: December 8, 2010

by: /Ryan C. Fox/
Ryan C. Fox
Reg. No.: 65,369